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• No COI related to this presentation

Because I said so!

There is absolutely no evidence supporting this requirement as it is written in the insurance policies!

That's why!

THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THIS REQUIREMENT AS IT IS WRITTEN IN THE INSURANCE POLICIES!

There is some evidence suggesting that this requirement should be changed!
Why Graduated Compression Is An Insurance Requirement?

• Does Compression eliminate the need for interventions?
• Does Compression improve symptoms and QOL?
• Does compression prevent progression?

Phlebology 2011;26:235–236

69 new patients with symptomatic varicose veins and GSV reflux

1 patients lost
3 patients not compliant with compression

65 used stockings (M=103 days)

64 (98%) chose an intervention
1 (2%) chose compression Tx

Compression therapy may eliminate the need for intervention in ≤ 2% of patients

64 (98%) chose an intervention
1 (2%) chose compression Tx

SUMMARY:

• Compression does not eliminate the need for interventions in the majority of patients
• Compression improves symptoms QOL in significantly smaller proportion of patients
• There are only anecdotal data suggesting that compression prevents progression of CVD

HOWEVER...

• Patients who do NOT benefit from compression are less likely to benefit from interventions
• A trial of compression therapy helps to differentiate between venous and non-venous symptoms
CONCLUSION

• Insurance policies should be changed!
• There should be requirement for a trial of compression therapy (which must be covered!)
• Improvement of symptoms should be an indication for intervention
• If symptoms do not improve, an intervention is still indicated after a reasonable work up to rule out other causes